Final Work Plan/Integrated Table

November 28, 2005

Issue Papers	**Elements to address from Structure Document**	**Leaders**
1. Problem Definition: What are the air quality problems to health and the environment? How do we determine and characterize on an ongoing basis the air quality problems that need to be addressed? --EPA provides written summary of John Bachmann's presentation (will be used as a basis for problem definition) --NRC recommendations (background and context) --Vision and Principles (background and context)	1, 3, 5, 17	**Janet McCabe** Jeanette Clute Sharon Kneiss Jeff Underhill Pam Giblin Erika Sasser John Bachmann
2. Air Quality Planning Process: --Multi-pollutant planning: Should air quality plans address all pollutants and sources of concern to a state or air quality planning region?	3, 5, 9, 15	**Brock Nicholson** Tom Chappel Jeff Underhill Margie Perkins Greg Dana John Hornback John Seitz Michael Bradley Janet McCabe Kimber Scavo
-- Boundaries: Planning and modeling are done on the basis of air quality management regions or airsheds (which may vary based on the pollutant). Should planning be done on the basis of areas that influence air quality levels rather than on artificial boundaries?	2, 3, 5	
-- Continued progress/deadlines: What should be the requirement for progress in areas with unacceptable air quality (toxic and criteria)?	3, 4, 14	

-- Measuring progress & accountability on an ongoing basis: How can accountability measures provide for more timely adjustments to implementation programs?	3, 14, 15, 16	
-- Fundamental approach to air quality planning and sources of pollution: What is the best approach for addressing multi-pollutant emissions from new and existing sources of pollution? A. Should this approach be "technology based where all sources, existing and new, are expected to be controlled to a certain level(s)? (Advantage is perhaps greater "equity" and greater total emissions reduction). Alternatively, is the approach one that control (degree of and selection of sources to control) is determined by need through modeling? (Advantage is perhaps enough but not excess controls are applied). Each has its "pros and cons." Should one approach be chosen over the other? Should we continue a blend of the two, or should the "blend" be adjusted? B. What is the best approach for addressing emissions from new and existing sources, which sources (traditional and non-traditional) are appropriate for additional reductions and on what scale—to yield the most efficient methods for addressing the air quality management system needs of the future.	3, 6, 9, 18	
3. AQM coordinating function: How should the AQM framework coordinate with other programs such as land use, energy, transportation and climate.	3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18	**Lisa Gomez** Janet McCabe Mark Morford Bob Wyman Greg Dana Sharon Kneiss Chris Stoneman Debbie Wood William Auberle Michael Bradley Jack Brunton Tony DeLucia John Fooks Pam Giblin

		William Goldsmith Jerry Kotas Matthew Kuryla Mark MacLeod John Seitz Gene Trisko Steve Winkelman Bob Wyman
4. Improve Communications/Partnerships: How do we improve communication, make information available, increase trust and build partnerships among stakeholders?	11, 12, 13	**Stephen Hartsfield** John Crouch Patrick Cummins Debbie Stackhouse Jim Scherer Carolyn Green

List of Items from Structure Document (Numbers correspond to elements in above Table)

1. Problem definition and determining necessary reductions
2. Determine meaningful boundaries (e.g. state, air shed or other approach)
3. Transform the SIP process
4. Provide for continuous progress and accountability (are goals being achieved)
5. Deal with pollution transport (intercontinental, cross-border, regional, interstate)
6. Define roles at each level of government (federal, state, tribal, local)
7. Incorporate environmental justice and local impacts in air quality plans
8. Adapting the AQM system to a changing (and most likely warmer) climate and increasing coordination with other activities addressing climate change.*
9. Assess multi-pollutants, multi-effects
10. Coordinate AQM with land use (agriculture, forestry, sprawl, water impacts)
11. Increase trust between stakeholder groups, government agencies, and the public
12. Improve communication and access to information
13. Build partnerships among States, Tribes, industry, EPA and others
14. More proactive at problem solving
15. Expedite procedural requirements
16. Build in feedback mechanisms
17. Enhance ecosystem protection
18. Increase collaboration on energy use

***** While we did not have consensus on the wording of this bullet, all members of the team agreed that work could proceed.

Schedule/Team 1

I. Monthly Conference Calls (Tuesdays, 1:00-3:00 pm EST)
Call-in Number 919-541-4407:
November 1
December 6
January 10
February 7
March 7
April 4
May 2
June 6

II. Issue Paper/Report Milestones:

1. Outlines for Issue Papers due to Co-Chairs on Friday, Nov 18
2. Co-Chairs send out outlines to Team 1. Comments due by Friday Dec 2
3. Outlines discussed December 6
4. Coordinate with Team 2 (include regular calls with Team 2 Co-Chairs and ongoing information sharing)
5. Preliminary Drafts of Issue Papers: February 2006
6. Review and Comment with Team 1: February/April 2006
7. Review and Comment with Team 2: April 2006
8. Final Drafts of Issue Papers and Preliminary Overview Piece: July 2006
9. Circulate Products for Review and Comments: July/August 2006
10. Prepare Final Report: August/September 2006
11. Final Report to Subcommittee: September 2006

12. Finalize for November CAAAC meeting

III. Subcommittee Calls & Meetings

1. El Paso: Nov 16-17 (AQM Subcommittee will not meet but there will be an update to Full Committee)
2. Dec 12, 2:00-3:30: Subcommittee Conference Call to discuss Futures Narrative
3. Jan 24-25: Subcommittee Meeting in Dallas, TX
4. Feb 23, 2:00-3:30 (tentative): Subcommittee Conference Call
5. April 4-5 (tentative): Subcommittee Meeting: VA/DC
6. April 6 (tentative): Full CAAAC Meeting: VA/DC
7. May 18, 2:00-3:30 (tentative): Subcommittee Conference Call